34. ~~A method according to claim 26~~ further comprising the steps of forming a gate electrode over said semiconductor film with ~~said insulating film therebetween~~. --

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the review and consideration of the present application.

The Examiner's Office Action dated September 26, 2001 has been received and its contents reviewed. By this Amendment, new claims 26-34 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-34 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 15, 20, 26, 27 and 28 are independent.

Referring now to the Office Action, claims 1-15 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1-38 of U.S. Patent No. 6,180,439 ('439). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reason that claim 1, for example, of the '439 does not claim Applicants' presently claimed invention. Should the Examiner wishes to maintain this rejection, Applicants' would respectfully request the Examiner to point out specifically the claimed features of '439 that are allegedly in conflict with Applicants' claimed invention.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Suzawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,728,259 - hereafter Suzawa).

The presently claimed invention is generally directed to a method for manufacturing a semiconductor device, comprising the steps of irradiating a laser light to said semiconductor island after forming a semiconductor island having a tapered shape with an angle within a range of 20° to 50° between a side of the tapered shape and an underlying, as recited in independent claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 15, 20, 26, 27 and 28.

Suzawa et al., however, does not disclose or suggest irradiation of laser light, more specifically, irradiating a laser light to the semiconductor island after forming a semiconductor island having a tapered shape with an angle within a range of 20° to 50° between a side of the tapered shape and an underlying surface.

Moreover, Suzawa does not teach the effects of diffusing the nickel element which is locally blocked within the pattern and to promote the crystallization of the pattern, as disclosed in the last paragraph of page 40 and the second paragraph of page 41 in the specification of the subject application.

It is well-established that, in order to show obviousness, all limitations in the claim must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In Re Boyka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974); MPEP § 2143.03. It is error to ignore specific limitations distinguishing over the references. In Re Boe, 184 U.S.P.Q. 38, 505 F.2d 1297 (C.C.P.A. 1974); In Re Saether, 181 U.S.P.Q. 36, 492 F.2d 849 (C.C.P.A. 1974); In Re Glass, 176 U.S.P.Q. 489, 472 F.2d 1388 (C.C.P.A. 1973). As Suzawa fails to teach, disclose, or suggest irradiating a laser light to the semiconductor island after forming a semiconductor island having a tapered shape with an angle within a range of 20° to 50° between a side of the tapered shape and an underlying surface, the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-25 is insupportable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 1-25.

New claims 26-38 have been added to further complete the scope of the invention to which Applicants are entitled.

CONCLUSION

Having responded to all rejections set forth in the outstanding non-Final Office Action, it is submitted that claims 1-34 are now in condition for allowance. An early and favorable Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. In the event that the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of one or more of the above claims, the Examiner is courteously requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

By_____
Luan C. Do
Reg. No. 38,434

NIXON PEABODY, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 800
McLean, Virginia 22102
Telephone: (703) 790-9110
Facsimile: (703) 883-0370